

Morse, Bob

From: Griffiths, Rachel
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 5:02 PM
To: Morse, Bob
Cc: Metz, Chloe; Olsen, Marian; Pocze, Doug
Subject: Griffiss AFB - PFAS

Bob,

Marian's review on the Griffiss AFB AFFF SI was quite thorough and I don't have much to add. My comments are below... please let me know if you have any questions! I'm working on a rough area-by-area list for future work (like I'm doing for Plattsburgh), but I think they might both be better used as an internal checklist when/if we receive future work plans rather than something we send to the AF upfront.

-Rachel

Section 2.3 pg 7 line 628 and 664: Numbering typo – 17 used twice.

Section 3 – Field Activities and Analytical Protocol:

General: Will the USTs/ASTs containing PFAS be emptied?

Area 1: Any further investigation planned for sampling inaccessible UST contents? Were SB01004/005 installed below the bottom of the former UST/OWS (was targeted depth achieved for the borings?)?

Area 7: Please note in **Section 3.7.1.2** that 1 planned downgradient monitoring well was not installed due to underground utilities (stated in previous section for soil borings but reiterate for groundwater).

Area 11: Line 1802: Typo – FPAS

Area 18: Line 2108 – Incorrect figure reference – should be 3.16-1.

Section 4.3.3 pg 87 Area 11: Cites Area 11 falls within the Mohawk River watershed, however other references indicate otherwise. (4.2.4 pg 81-82 mentions distance to Three and Six Mile Creeks in terms of groundwater pathways. Figure 4.3-1 also indicates Area 11 is in the Six Mile Creek watershed.) Please reconcile occurrences (confusion possibly related to clarification of fate of surface runoff vs. groundwater). See also: Table on pg 89.

Figure 3.0-1: Suggest including Area 15 to map for clarity

Rachel E. Griffiths
Hydrogeologist
U.S. EPA Region 2
290 Broadway, 18th Floor
NY, NY 10007 | 212-637-3877
Griffiths.Rachel@epa.gov